



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The work of the translator has been well done. The value of the book is very much increased by the addition of a complete bibliography of works on economics in which mathematical reasoning is employed.

F. D. MERRITT.

Aristocracy and Evolution: A Study of the Rights, the Origin, and the Social Functions of the Wealthier Classes. By W. H. MALLOCK. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898. 8vo, pp. xxxiii + 385.

ON a cursory acquaintance with this volume one is tempted to dismiss it with the comment that Mr. Mallock has written another of his foolish books. The objective point of the new book is still the enforcement of the author's pet fallacy, which he has expounded so felicitously on many a former occasion. It is restated here with somewhat greater circumstance than before, and is backed by much telling illustration and some substantial information that might well have served a more useful purpose. A fuller acquaintance with its contents, however, will convince the reader that the book has substantial merits, although these merits do not belong with the economic side of the argument.

While the present volume covers a wider range of phenomena and traces the working of the great man's dominating efficiency through a greater variety of human relations than Mr. Mallock's earlier books have done, the chief point of the argument is still the productive efficiency of the great man in industry and the bearing of this productive efficiency upon the equitable claim of the wealthy classes to a superior share of the product. What is to be proven is the equity and the expediency of a system of distribution in which a relatively large share of the product of industry goes to the owners of capital and the directors of business. For this purpose "the great man" in industry is tacitly identified with the captain of industry or the owner of capital. It is right that the great man, so understood, should receive a large share, because he produces a large proportion of the product of industry (book iii; pp. 197-267). And it is expedient that exceptional gains should come to this exceptional wealth-producer, because on no other terms can he be induced to take care of the economic welfare of the community—and, in the nature of things,

the welfare of the community, of the many, lies unreservedly in the hands of the minority of great men (book iv; pp. 271-380).

The few are the chief producers.

All the democratic formulas which for the past hundred years have represented the employed as the producers of wealth, and the capitalistic employers as the appropriators of it, are, instead of being, as they claim to be, the expressions of a profound truth, related to truth only as being direct inversions of it. Whatever appearances may seem to show to the contrary, it is the few and not the many who, in the domain of economic production, are essentially and permanently the chief repositories of power (pp. 174-175).

The case of labour directed by different great men is the same as the case of labour applied to different qualities of land. The great men produce the increment. Labour, however, must be held to produce that minimum necessary to the support of the labourers, both in agriculture and in all kinds of production. The great man produces the increment that would not be produced by labour if his influence ceased. Labour, it is true, is essential to the production of the increment, also; but we cannot draw any conclusions from the hypothesis of labour ceasing; for the labourers would have to labor whether the great men were there or no (pp. 202-206, margin). The efficiency of labour itself is practically constant; and for the student of wealth-production the principal force to be studied is the ability of the few, by which the labour of the many is multiplied, and which only exerts itself under special social circumstances (p. 209, note).

We are thus enabled to discriminate arithmetically between the share of the product due to the great men and that due to the many.

Let us take the case of the United Kingdom, and consider the amount per head that was annually produced by the population a hundred years ago. This amount was about £14. At the present time it is something like £35 Now, if we attribute the entire production of this country, at the close of the last century, to common or average labour (which is plainly an absurd concession), we shall gain some idea of what the utmost limits of the independent productivity of the ordinary man are; for the ordinary man's talents as a producer, when directed by nobody but himself, have, as has been said already, not appreciably increased in the course of two thousand years, and have certainly not increased within the past three generations. The only thing that has increased has been the concentration on the ordinary man's productive talents of the productive talents of the exceptional man. The talents of the exceptional man, in fact, have been the only variant in the problem; and, accordingly, the minimum which these talents produce is the total difference between £14 and £35.

This argument may be restated in a more concise arithmetical form after adding a further premise, which is implied, though not fully taken account of, in Mr. Mallock's exposition. The talents of the ordinary man have not changed within the past three generations, or if they have changed it is but by a variation so small that it can only be indicated, not quantitatively registered; the like is true of the talents of the exceptional man. This latter feature of the premises has not been brought out by Mr. Mallock, although his claim that human talents have remained constant plainly involves it. The traits of human nature have not appreciably changed within the period in question. The race of British subjects is much the same as it has been. But in order to allow for a possible, though inappreciable change; in the talents of the two classes, the conceivable infinitesimal change may be indicated by the use of accents. The arithmetical problem in hand will then present the following result:

$$(1) \quad o \text{ (ordinary)} \times g \text{ (great man)} = 14.$$

$$(2) \quad o' \times g' = 35.$$

But since 35 may be broken up and written $14 + 21$, it follows that, in the second equation, 21 of the entire product (35) is the product of g' alone. *Q. E. D.*

This traverses the ancient traditions of arithmetic, but it is to be said in legitimization of this procedure that it would be extremely difficult to get the same result by a different method. Any man encumbered with a hide-bound arithmetic would find himself constrained to look for some other variable in the problem than a special segment of that human nature which is by supposition declared invariable; nor would such a one have the courage to portion out the *meum* and *tuum* as between two factors of a joint product. But Mr. Mallock is without fear.

Some account, though scant, is taken by Mr. Mallock of the phenomena of transmitted knowledge, usages, and methods of work; but these facts are not allowed to count as against the primacy of the great man. And as regards this great man, where he is first characterized and expounded, in the chapter especially devoted to him ("Great Men, as the True Cause of Progress," pp. 55-88), the chief variants of him that concern economic theory are the inventor, the overseer of industrial processes, and the business man. The impression is conveyed in this early chapter that for the industrial purpose the greatest of these is the inventor, and next him ranks the director of

mechanical processes, while the business man comes into view as a wealth-producer chiefly in an indirect way by influencing the motions of the two former, and, through them, the motions of "ordinary men" engaged in manual labor. At a later point, when the question comes to concern the appraisement of productivity and the equitable apportionment of the product, the inventor, the engineer and the foreman disappear behind the business man's ledger, as the peppercorn disappears behind the nutshell, and "the great man" becomes synonymous with "the captain of industry." By a curious inversion of his own main position, Mr. Mallock reaches the broad verdict that consumable goods are mainly produced by the captain of industry. His main position, so far as regards industrial efficiency, is that the greatness and efficiency of the great man lie in his superior knowledge, which he is able to impose upon others and so direct their efforts to the result aimed at. "The master of knowledge, as applied to production, is the inventor" (p. 138). "The inventor . . . is an agent of 'social progression' only because the particularized knowledge of which his invention consists is embodied either in models, or drawings, or written or spoken orders, and thus affects the technical action of whole classes of other men" (p. 139). Under the capitalistic wage system "productive power has increased because capital . . . has enabled a few men to apply, with the most constant and intense effort, their intellectual faculties to industry in its minutest details" (p. 161). Productive efficiency, therefore, is a matter of detailed knowledge of the technical processes of industry, and the application of this knowledge through directing the technical movements of others. Yet the type of productive efficiency in the advanced portion of Mr. Mallock's argument is taken to be the counting-house activity of the business man, who frequently does not, and pretty uniformly need not, have any technical knowledge of the industry that goes on under his hand. His relation to the mechanical processes is always remote, and usually of a permissive kind only. This is especially true of the director of a large business, who is by that fact, if he is successful, a highly efficient great man. He delegates certain men, perhaps at the second or third remove, to assume discretion and set certain workmen and machines in motion under the guidance of technical knowledge possessed by them, not by him. The captain's efficiency is not to be called in question, but it is bold irony to call it productive efficiency under the definition of productivity set up by Mr. Mallock.

Most modern men would have been content to justify the business man's claim to a share in the product on the ground of his serviceability to the community, without specifically imputing to him the major part in the production of goods; but Mr. Mallock's abounding faith in the canons of natural rights compels him naively to account for the business man's income in terms of productive efficiency simply. The argument of the book as is evident especially in the concluding portion (book iv; pp. 271-380), is chiefly directed to the confutation of the socialists. And in this confutation it is the ancient, now for the most part abandoned, socialist position that is made the point of attack. This early socialist position was summed up in the claim that to the laborer should belong the entire product of his labor. The claim is a crude application of a natural-rights dogma, and for the living generation of socialists it may fairly be said to be a discarded standpoint. It is this dead dog that Mr. Mallock chiefly belabors. Together with this, the similarly obsolete natural-rights formula that all men are born free and equal comes in for a portion of his polemical attention. In all this, the polemic proceeds on the lost ground of natural rights. Objection is taken not to the obvious groundlessness of the whole natural-rights structure, but to the scope of the application given the dogmas and to the excessive narrowness of the definitions employed.

Through it all, however, Mr. Mallock very effectively presents the current arguments going to show that the pecuniary incentive is indispensable to modern industry, and he shows, with great detail and with good effect, the weakness of the socialist contentions on this head. He goes with the socialists to the length of showing that the pecuniary incentive—the desire of wealth—is in large part a desire for distinction only, not in the last analysis a desire for the material, consumable goods. But he denies flatly—what they affirm—that an emulative incentive of another kind might serve the turn if the pecuniary incentive were to fall away. No other method of gauging success and distinction will take the place of this one as an incentive to wealth-production, whatever seems to be true as regard other directions of effort (book iv. chap. ii; pp. 284-323). It is to be regretted that nothing beyond asseveration is put forward in support of this denial, which is the central feature of the refutation of socialism. No decisive argument for the denial is adduced, but through the assertion made there runs an implication that, in order to serve their purpose at all effectively, the inducements offered the wealth-producer

must mechanically resemble the results to be worked out. As on the homeopathic principle like is to be cured by like, so in industry the repugnance to effort spent on material goods must be overcome by a remedial application of material goods. While it seems to be present in the reasoning, it is by no means clear, it should be remarked, that this axiom of similarity has been present in the reasoner's mind.

Mr. Mallock is a master of pleasing diction, and his arguments are presented in a lucid and forcible way that makes the book very attractive reading. And the grotesquely devious ways of its economic argument do not prevent it from being a suggestive contribution to the discussion of cultural development. At many points it brings out in a strong light the importance of a gifted minority as an element in the process of institutional growth, although even here it is curious, and in a sense instructive, to note that as representative spokesmen of the modern social sciences, Mr. Mallock has been constrained to cite George, Laveleye, and Mr. Kidd. The discussion of the great man's place in the cultural process is at its best where it deals with other fields than the economic. Unfortunately, it is the economic bearing of the argument alone that can be taken up here.

The volume suffers from a meretricious increase of bulk, due to an excessive use of large type, wide margins and heavy paper. It should be added that the printer's work is altogether above reproach.

T. B. V.

L'année Sociologique. Publiée sous le direction de ÉMILE DURKHEIM. *Première année (1896-7).* Paris: Felix Alcan, 1898. 8vo. pp. vii+563.

L'ANNÉE SOCIOLOGIQUE is the title of a new sociological review edited by Professor Émile Durkheim, of Bordeaux. Associated with Professor Durkheim in the publication are MM. Simmel, Richard, E. Levy, Bouglé, Fauconnet, Hubert, Lapie, Mauss, A. Milhaud, Muffang, Parodi, and Simiand. The purpose of this new year-book is to afford a medium for the publication of contributions to sociological theory and of studies in those lines from which sociology must draw its materials, such as the history of law, custom, religion and morals, and economics, and to give analyses and bibliographical notes of the contributions in these lines elsewhere published.